



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/875,670	06/05/2001	Nigel Andrew Justin Davies	80398P394	7529

7590

05/03/2004

Archana B. Vittal
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/875,670

Applicant(s)

DAVIES ET AL.

Examiner

Mohammad A Siddiqi

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2004.
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11,15,19,20,25-29,33, 35-43 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 12-14, 16-18, 21-24, 30-32, 34 is/are rejected.
 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-11,15,19,20,25-29,33, and 35-43 are presented for examination. Claims 2, 12-14, 16-18, 21-24, 30-32 and 34 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1, 3-11, 15, 19, 20, 25-29, 33, and 35-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shteyn et al. (6618764) (hereinafter Shteyn).

4. As per independent claims 1,25, and 33, Shteyn discloses a controller (col 2, lines 28-30) comprising at least one Home Audio Visual Initiative (HAVi) server that communicates with at least one HAVi compliant device using HAVi application programming interface (API) and further communicates with (col 20,lines 12-42 and col 6, lines 4-39) at least one proxy on at least Internet Protocol (IP) device using an IP and HAVi API (col 20,lines 12-42 and col 6, lines 4-39), the server communicating with the IP device via the Internet Protocol (col 20,lines 12-42) the IP and HAVi API providing API support to and relay calls between the proxy and the server so that one of the at least one HAVi compliant and the IP device controls the other one of the devices (figure 3, col 6, lines 30-40).

5. As per claim 3, Shteyn discloses an IP device control module (DCM), wherein at least one HAVi compliant device (col 3, lines 3-9), the HAVi compliant device control the IP device by accessing a DCM associated with the device (col 3, lines 33-39).

6. As per claim 4, Shteyn discloses the HAVi compliant device is physically located on the controller (figure 2, col 11, lines 24-30).

7. As per claims 5, 26, and 36, Shteyn discloses a HAVi stack that enables the IP DCMs to be instantiated independently of bus reset events (col 4, lines 1-21).
8. As per claim 6, Shteyn discloses server communicates with IP devices across a first communication medium and HAVi compliant devices across a second communication medium (col 4, lines 22-36).
9. As per claims 7, 39, and 42, Shteyn discloses the first communication medium is selected from the group consisting of fiber, optical, cable, wire and wireless networks (col 1, lines 52-65 and col 2, lines 38-47).
10. As per claim 8, Shteyn discloses the second communication medium is an IEEE 1394 network (col 1, lines 52-65).
11. As per claims 9, 40, and 43, Shteyn discloses comprising a stream bridge configured to capture content from a first device of IP and HAVi compliant devices coupled to the controller and relay it to a second device of IP and HAVi compliant devices (col 3, lines 54-58).

12. As per claim 10, Shteyn discloses wherein the controller is selected from the group consisting of HAVi full audio/visual (FAV) device and intermediate audio/visual device (col 15 lines 14-20).

13. As per independent claims 11, 20, and 29, Shteyn discloses a controller (col 2, lines 28-30) comprising at least one server that communicates with at least one first network compliant device using a first network application programming interface (API) and a first protocol, and the server (col 20, lines 12-42 and col 6, lines 4-39) communicating with a proxy on at least one second network compliant device using a first and second network API (col 20, lines 12-42 and col 6, lines 4-39), the server communicating with the second network compliant device via a second protocol, API providing API support to translate and relay calls between proxy and the server so that at least one of the first and second network compliant devices controls the other one of the network compliant devices (col 20, lines 12-42 and figure 3, col 6, lines 30-40).

14. As per independent claim 15 Shteyn discloses a proxy to communicates with a Home Audio Visual Initiative (HAVi) server on a controller using the Internet protocol (col 2, lines 28-30); and

at least one IP and HAVi application programming interface (API) (col 20, lines 12-42 and col 6, lines 4-39) configured to translate and relay communications between the IP device and the server using the Internet protocol, the server configured to manage the proxy so that one of the IP device and a HAVi compliant device coupled to the HAVi server controls the other one of the devices (figure 3, col 6, lines 30-40).

15. As per claims 19, 28, and 37, Shteyn discloses streaming protocol to support streaming of content between the IP device and the controller (col 1, lines 42-46).

16. As per claim 27, Shteyn discloses the second HAVi compliant device is selected from the group consisting of the first HAVi compliant device and a device coupled to the first HAVi compliant device through a network (col 1, lines 36-43).

17. As per claim 35, Shteyn discloses instantiating an IP device control module (DCM) on the controller corresponding to the IP device, wherein at least one HAVi compliant device (col 3, lines 3-9) controls the IP device by accessing a DCM correspond to the IP device (col 3, lines 33-39).

18. As per claim 38, Shteyn discloses a device control module (DCM), wherein the first network compliant device controls the second network

compliant device by accessing the DCM (col 3, lines 33-40 and col 4, lines 1-29).

19. As per claim 41, Shteyn discloses instantiating a device control module (DCM) on the controller, wherein one of the first network compliant devices controls the second network compliant devices by accessing the DCM (col 3, lines 33-40 and col 4, lines 1-29).

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 03/08/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive:

2. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the bridge device can be controlled any of the devices on either network) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

3. In response to applicant's argument "Shteyn does not teach or suggest", the examiner respectfully disagrees. The Shteyn's Home API architecture provides claimed services (col 3-6, proxy by definition is an intermediary program that acts as both a server and a client for the purpose of making requests on behalf of other clients. Proxies are often used as client-side portals (i.e., a trusted agent that can access the Internet on the client's behalf) through the network firewall and as helper applications for handling requests via protocols not implemented by the user agent). Therefore, limitations are met by the reference.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will

expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A Siddiqi whose telephone number is (703) 305-0353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 306-5404.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

MAS



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100